

Governance

Cross-College School of Public Policy Model	College of Public Policy Model
<p>To achieve the goals articulated above, a successful cross-college school of public policy would need its own dean (possibly one who reported directly to the provost) and would need to function with a great deal of autonomy from the two colleges that contribute the majority of lines to it (CHE and CAS) in order to succeed. This autonomy should include, maybe most crucially, decision-making around hiring in the School. If the School Dean does not have autonomy around hiring, the committee generally felt that the School was unlikely to succeed to the level of ambition that Cornell has in public policy.</p> <p>There was a general sense that a shared dean model (CHE and CAS deans co-control the School) or a dependent dean model (CHE and CAS deans co-control the School with the dean of the School) was unlikely to make it possible for the School to achieve the level of prominence Cornell is seeking to achieve in policy, mostly because the dean would have to depend on and negotiate securing scarce resources from two other deans. There are examples at Cornell of this kind of negotiation working, but it is more complicated, and the committee generally agreed that this was not the preferred method.</p>	<p>A College of Public Policy would have its own dean, and that Dean would have to enthusiastically advocate for the college in the policy arena (given the college's transformation into a new policy entity and also according to the unique CHE-aligned components of policy). All policy-relevant faculty would have some form of full or joint appointments with the College. Collectively, that group of faculty would be responsible for decision-making around policy scholarship, hiring, teaching, training, and outreach. The exact nature of the governance model in this version of a College model would have to be carefully considered.</p>
<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility for a new dean "starting fresh" to operate in collaboration with existing deans to from a new entity they would help create • High coherence around public policy • Inherent sharing and collaboration built into the structure from the start could make it easier to realize a university-wide entity • Simple structure whereby governance handled by professors affiliated with school. For example, a professor in the Sociology super-department who wants to be in the School could be a Professor of Sociology and Public Policy and holds appointments in the School and CHE. School governance would be enabled by the affiliated Professors of Public Policy. 	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean could have a prominent and visible platform from which to advocate for policy at Cornell • Dean would have significant autonomy and resources to focus the college around policy • Could foster a distinctive and strong policy brand, which could set Cornell apart from other policy schools • Faculty would need to provide service only to their college and a super-department (similar to existing super-departments)
<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and coordination problems in a range of areas (including new hiring from across the university) because of the inherent complexities of coordinating with multiple deans • Adds a new dean to the university, raising the ultimate decision making around complex allocation of resources to the provost level • CHE/CAS deans may be unwilling to serve in a more limited advisory role to the School • Coordination of super-departments across three units (for at least Sociology and Economics) could be challenging. For example, service obligations of faculty would need to be carefully articulated for each faculty member to avoid overwhelming service 	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean would need to lead and govern a diverse college with a combination of faculty who work directly and indirectly in policy into a more policy-aligned college • Would have to negotiate with CAS dean (and other units) for shared lines and hiring (e.g., joint appointments) • Would have to show the rest of the university that it is not just an insular college entity or rebranding of CHE but a university-wide policy entity • Would need to formalize systems to integrate the research and teaching of faculty whose work is more indirectly related to policy, while also focusing the mission of the college more centrally around policy

<p>obligations to many units, i.e., to a college, a school, and a super-department, possibly leading faculty to provide minimal service to some or all units and harming research productivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pool of potential deans who could represent such a unique policy school may be small
<p>Unresolved Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are a number of unresolved issues around governance, especially because the exact model we propose of a strong School does not have a perfect parallel elsewhere at Cornell (although there are some possibly relevant examples, such as CIS).	<p>Unresolved issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The largest unresolved issue that our committee discussed at length was how to gradually move the college toward a more policy-focused entity, given that there are some units or individuals who may not see their work as core to the policy mission.• The exact nature of the policy governance structure in the College still needs to be carefully considered and articulated.